

Charles Holbrook Library
Pacific School of Religion
1798 Scenic Ave.
Berkeley, California

Social Questions Bulletin

Volume 45

MARCH, 1955

Number 3

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation stands for the complete abolition of war. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decision, not by violence.

THE TIME TO ABOLISH WAR IS NOW!

By GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

(Just after President Eisenhower asked Congress for advance approval of any war measures he might choose to take against China over Formosa, General MacArthur made his stirring appeal against the suicidal folly of war. It was January 26, an address for the Los Angeles Council of the American Legion. On the explosive Far Eastern situation the general commented: "Whatever betides, the ultimate fate of the Far East—and indeed the world—will not be settled by force of arms. We may all be practically annihilated—but war can no longer be an arbiter of survival." Consider the general's argument. If convinced, write your president and your congressmen. Suggest we concentrate on abolishing war, in concert with the other major powers, rather than on launching one which could abolish mankind.)

War has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. No longer is it the weapon of adventure whereby a short cut to international power and wealth—a place in the sun—can be attained. If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess the chance of the winner in a duel—it contains rather the germs of double suicide. Science has clearly outmoded it as a feasible arbiter. The great question—does this mean that war can now be outlawed from the world?—so, it would mark the greatest advance in civilization since the Sermon on the Mount. It would lift at one stroke the darkest shadow which has engulfed mankind from the beginning. It would not only remove fear and bring security—it would not only create new moral and spiritual values—it would produce an economic wave of prosperity that would raise the world's standard of living beyond anything ever dreamed of by man. The hundreds of billions of dollars now spent in mutual preparedness could conceivably abolish poverty from the face of the globe. It would accomplish even more than this; it would at one stroke reduce the international tensions that seem so insurmountable now to matters of more probable solution. For instance, the complex problems of German rearmament, of preventive war, of satellite domination by major powers, of Universal Military Service, of unconscionable taxation, of nuclear development for industry, of free exchange of goods and people, of foreign aid and, indeed, of all issues involving the application of armed force. It would have equally potent political effects. It would reduce immeasurably the power of leaders of Government and thus render more precarious totalitarian or autocratic rule.

You will say at once that although the abolition of war has been the dream of man for centuries every proposition to that end has been promptly discarded as impossible and fantastic. Every cynic, every pessimist, every adventurer, every swash-buckler in the world has always disclaimed its feasibility. But that was before the science of the past decade made mass destruction a reality. The argument then was the human character has never reached a theological development which would permit the application of pure idealism. In the past two thousand years its rate of change has been deplorably slow, compared to that of the arts and sciences. But now the tremendous and present evolution of nuclear and other potentials of destruction has suddenly taken the problem away from

its primary consideration as a moral and spiritual question and brought it abreast of scientific realism. It is no longer an ethical equation to be pondered solely by learned philosophers and ecclesiastics but a hard core one for the decision of the masses whose survival is the issue. This is as true of the Soviet side of the world as of the free side—as true behind the Iron Curtain as in front of it. The ordinary people of the world, whether free or slave, are all in agreement on this solution; and this perhaps is the only thing in the world they do agree upon. But it is the most vital and determinate of all. The leaders are the laggards. The disease of power seems to confuse and befuddle them. They have not even approached the basic problem, much less evolved a working formula to implement this public demand. They debate and turmoil over a hundred issues—they bring us to the verge of despair or raise our hopes to Utopian heights over the corollary misunderstandings that stem from the threat of war—but never in the chancelleries of the world or the halls of the United Nations is the real problem raised. Never do they dare to state the bald truth, that the next great advance in the evolution of civilization cannot take place until war is abolished. It may take another cataclysm of destruction to prove to them this simple truth. But, strange as it may seem, it is known now by all common men. It is the one issue upon which both sides can agree, for it is the one issue upon which both sides will profit equally. It is the one issue—and the only decisive one—in which the interests of both are completely parallel. It is the one issue which, if settled, might settle all others.

A Matter of Profit

Time has shown that agreements between modern nations are generally no longer honored or valid unless both profit therefrom. But both sides can be trusted when both do profit. It becomes then no longer a problem based upon relative integrity. It is now no longer convincing to argue, whether true or not, that we cannot trust the other side—that one maverick can destroy the herd. It would no longer be a matter depending upon trust—the self-interest of each nation outlawing war would keep it true to itself. And there is no influence so potent and powerful as self-interest. It would not necessarily require international inspection of relative armaments—the public opinion of every part of the world would be the great denominator which would insure the issue—each nation would so profit that it could not fail eventually to comply. This would not, of course, mean the abandonment of all armed forces, but it would reduce them to the simpler problems of internal order and international police. It would not mean utopia at one fell stroke, but it would mean that the great roadblock now existing to development of the human race would have been cleared.

The present tensions with their threat of national annihilation are kept alive by two great illusions. The one, a complete belief on the part of the Soviet world that the capitalist countries are preparing to attack them; that sooner or later we intend to strike. And the other, a complete belief on the part of the capitalistic countries that the Soviets are preparing to attack us; that sooner or later they intend to strike. Both are wrong. Each

side, so far as the masses are concerned, is equally desirous of peace. For either side war with the other would mean nothing but disaster. Both equally dread it. But the constant acceleration of preparation may well, without specific intent, ultimately produce a spontaneous combustion.

I am sure that every pundit in the world, every cynic and hypocrite, every paid brainwasher, every egotist, every troublemaker, and many others of entirely different mold, will tell you with mockery and ridicule that this can be only a dream—that it is but the vague imaginings of a visionary. But, as David Lloyd George once said in Commons at the crisis of the First World War, "We must go on or we will go under." And the great criticism we can make of the world's leaders is their lack of a plan which will enable us "to go on." All they propose merely gravitates around but dares not face the real problem. They increase preparedness by alliances, by distributing resources throughout the world, by feverish activity in developing new and deadlier weapons, by applying conscription in times of peace—all of which is instantly matched by the prospective opponent. We are told that this increases the chances of peace—which is doubtful—and increases the chances of victory if war comes—which would be incontestable if the other side did not increase in like proportion. Actually, the truth is that the relative strengths of the two change little with the years. Action by one is promptly matched by reaction from the other.

I recall so vividly this problem when it faced the Japanese in their new Constitution. They are realists; and they are the only ones that know by dread experience the fearful effect of mass annihilation. They realize in their limited geographical area, caught up as a sort of no mans land between two great ideologies, that to engage in another war, whether on the winning or the losing side, would spell the probable doom of their race. And their wise old Prime Minister, Shidehara, came to me and urged that to save themselves they should abolish war as an international instrument. When I agreed, he turned to me and said, "The world will laugh and mock us as impractical visionaries, but a hundred years from now we will be called prophets."

Sooner or later the world, if it is to survive, must reach this decision. The only question is, when? Must we fight again before we learn? When will some great figure in power have sufficient imagination and moral courage to translate this universal wish—which is rapidly becoming a universal necessity—into actuality? We are in a new era. The old methods and solutions no longer suffice. We must have new thoughts, new ideas, new concepts, just as did our venerated forefathers when they faced a new world. We must break out of the straitjacket of the past. There must always be one to lead, and we should be that one. We should now proclaim our readiness to abolish war in concert with the great powers of the world. The result would be magical.

ONCE WE TALKED ABOUT ODD IDEAS

I was interested to read recently, from the pen of an economic writer, that the American, Henry George (dead almost six decades), has had a notable part in the vast land reforms which have taken place in Great Britain. And these land reforms have re-echoed on every continent.

Now Henry George was not an orthodox thinker. He had the notion that "the land of every country belongs to all the people of that country"; that private ownership is un-moral; that one generation cannot (or rather should not) "pass land down" to just a few favored children in the next. And so Henry George proposed that each person using land should pay a "rent" for it to all the people—the state; that all government needs be taxed against this property belonging to all; and that no tax be levied against anything a man makes with his own hands.

"Progress and Poverty" (1879), a volume expanding this idea, was a best seller. A political party grew up around the theory. The author ran for mayor in New York. He was feted, idolized, debated; but he never convinced a majority of the people. Americans were not—are not now—willing to communalize real property. But the discussion—even agitation—set millions thinking on the subject, and much land reform the world over stems from Henry George's provocative ideas.

I point this out to suggest (1) that much of good has come from the free discussion of a new and revolutionary idea; (2)

that Americans, in the long run, knew what they wanted economically, and what they did not want they did not accept. Certainly Henry George's idea is anti-capitalistic; it is a definite form of socialism, akin to "pure communism." Were he pressing his point today, would we call him a "parlor pink," a "fellow traveller," one "following the communist line?" Would we stifle the idea, or punish the man, and rob the world of the real values that were gained by years of discussion?

I believe Americans still have the ability to choose wisely between conflicting ideologies if there is free discussion. They won't run off at tangents. And that is why I am troubled by the pressures today to keep men from expressing anything other than "majority opinion." Are we not losing initiative, exploration, free discussion: these are the very bases of democracy and progress!

Methodism's Board of Education says officially: "Pressures, fears, suspicion threaten the right and responsibility of teachers to teach the truth as they see it within their subject matter competence." The clergy, writers, legislators—even our friends and neighbors—often won't speak freely because of "pressures, fears, suspicion" that threaten any unorthodox word or idea. "Pressure, fears, suspicion" can rob a man and his family of their means of living, of social standing, of physical freedom itself. But the silencing of one man may also rob all mankind.

Don't we trust Americans to know right from wrong, good from evil, the wise from the foolish, any more? By W. W. Reid

WHAT OUR OFFICIALS SAID OF FORMOSA

"In the Joint Declaration at Cairo, the President of the United States, the British Prime Minister, and the President of China stated that territories Japan had stolen from China, such as Formosa, should be restored to China.

"The U. S. was signatory to the Potsdam Declaration which declared terms of Cairo should be carried out. The provisions were accepted by Japan.

"The U. S. has no desire to obtain special rights or privileges or military bases on Formosa . . . nor any intentions of utilizing its armed forces to interfere. The U. S. will not pursue a course to involvement in the civil conflict in China. The U. S. Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."—President Harry S. Truman, Jan. 5, 1950.

"The Chinese have administered Formosa for four years. Neither the U. S. nor any other ally ever questioned authority of that occupation. The world must believe that we stand for principle and that we are honorable and decent people and that we do not put forward words as propagandists do in other countries, only to throw them overboard, when some change in events makes the position difficult for us. Therefore, we are not going to use our forces in connection with Formosa."

—Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

"I shall not favor sending a single American boy with gun in hand to Formosa to settle a civil war six thousand miles away from home."

—Senator Tom Connally.

"Formosa, politically, economically, and geographically is part of China. Politically and militarily it is a strict Chinese responsibility.

"Loss of the island is widely anticipated, and the manner in which civil and military conditions have deteriorated under the Nationalists adds weight to these expectations.

"Formosa has no special military significance. (There is) a mistaken popular conception of its strategic importance to United States defense in the Pacific.

"Seeking United States bases in Formosa, sending in troops, supplying arms, dispatching naval units . . . would . . . involve the United States in a long-term venture producing at best a new area of bristling stalemate, and at worst possible involvement in open warfare. Communists charge the United States with conspiring to build the island into a fortress to be taken over by the United States . . . thereby trying to brand the United States with the mark of aggressive imperialism."

Policy Information Paper—Formosa, of the United States Information Service, Dec. 23, 1949. This important official paper was declassified and made public in the 1951 MacArthur hearings, pp. 1667-1669.

ON PAY FOR PROFESSIONAL PERJURY

Harvey Matusow was for years a paid professional witness for congressional committees and the Department of Justice. His paid testimony helped send other Americans to jail. He now swears he was guilty of perjury for years of profitable testimony for the government against communists and non-communists alike. He charges further that other paid professional ex-communist witnesses for the government have lied, e.g., Crouch, Johnson, Bentley, Budenz. He offers to take a lie detector test and challenges the other paid witnesses to do the same.

He adds that government agents knew of his past perjury and helped fabricate it. In the case of the convicted and jailed Communist Party leaders, he says Roy Cohn helped him fabricate testimony directly linking the defendants with an advocacy of violence for which he in fact had no evidence. In the case of Clinton Jencks, convicted and jailed union official, Matusow now swears he lacked evidence for his trial testimony that Jencks was a communist. Jencks had signed a Taft-Hartley non-communist affidavit; so Matusow's testimony sent him to jail for perjury.

Matusow details now how he worked with Senator McCarthy and J. B. Matthews by taking out of the country a wealthy lady (he later married) whose large contributions to the senator might have embarrassing had she stayed in the country available for testimony before the Senate Sub-Committee seeking information on the senator's financial dealings. One of the persons victimized by Matusow's former testimony is Methodist Bishop Oxnham.

In addition to Matusow, two other paid government witnesses have recently confessed to perjury: Mrs. Marie Natvig of Miami Beach and Mr. Lowell Watson, a Kansas farmer ex-communist.

The government agencies involved cannot wash their hands of responsibility for the past perjury, now confessed. The Washington Post and Times-Herald editorialized on Feb. 2:

"How many Americans have been unjustly convicted on the basis of Matusow's perjured testimony? How many others have been sent to prison or condemned before congressional investigating committees by other former communist perjurers who, like Matusow, decided to make witnessing a lucrative career? There are questions which the Department of Justice needs to ask itself. For it has been careless in the extreme in accepting the bona fides of self-serving witnesses and in leaving unprosecuted those who admitted perjury but turned state's evidence."

The conservative columnist, Stewart Alsop, wrote (Sunday, March 6, N. Y. Herald Tribune):

"From the very beginning there has been ample and solid evidence that Matusow was a liar, evidence wholly available to the Congressional committees and to the Justice Department. Early in 1952 (he) testified under oath before the Senate Security Sub-Committee that 'he knew by sight probably 10,000 Communist Party members in New York.' This was inherently and obviously a lie. Yet Matusow was an anti-communist witness, a 'friendly' witness. So no questions were asked.

"In the autumn of 1952 speaking in Montana as an 'expert on Communism' Matusow said on the record that the Sunday section of The New York Times alone has 126 dues-paying Communists. This particular lie was spotted by reporters who pointed out that the entire staff of The Times' Sunday section numbered eighty-seven, including two part-time copy boys.

"But right through 1953, as long as Matusow said what was expected of him, the Justice Department went right on hiring him and putting him on the stand as an 'expert witness'.

"There is crying need for an honest and straightforward inquiry by both Congress and the Justice Department (to) determine why neither the committee staffs nor the Justice Department investigators apparently made any effective attempt to establish the credibility of such 'expert' witnesses as Matusow. A serious inquiry would also examine most seriously the flatly contradictory and demonstrably untrue testimony of other professional witnesses."

In the summer of 1953, paid perjurers were employed in efforts to smear the Protestant ministry. This Bulletin's editor exercised the privilege of telling congressmen under oath that the witnesses were liars and perjurers and that they should be charged and tried. He was denied the old-fashioned American right of cross-examining the accusers to show further their falsity. One of them had placed him in New York in high political leadership at a date when he was, in fact, still in the small South Georgia town of his birth, a young lad just emerging from junior high school and into the Boy Scouts.

But despite much evidence of past perjury by their paid "friendly" witnesses, the government has never indicted such a perjurer. On the contrary the government has paid them for their perjured testimony—liberally, with taxpayer funds. Perjury has not yet been treated as a crime, if committed on behalf of the contemporary political heresy hunt.

One would hope that our congressmen and Department of

Justice would be deeply concerned to discover and act on the truth, to right every wrong done every individual as a result of perjured testimony. One would hope there would be serious effort to bring every government agent to book who has helped suborn perjury. One would like such elementary loyalty to justice and fair play from a justice department and from congressmen. But for that we still must wait. True, the department has quietly dropped from its payroll, we hear, some of its witnesses whose unreliability has been most clearly established and widely publicized by columnists. But is that enough? If their past and frequent perjury is so clear, should not the department on whose funds they drew, have the integrity to indict them and bring them to trial?

But so far government officials involved have sought rather to smear citizens who question their informer system, and to penalize the confessors and revealers of past perjury. That cat, it appears, they did not want out of the bag. Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins heads the Justice Department's Internal Security Division. Before a Senate committee starting to investigate the government security program, he said:

"It is becoming increasingly clear that the current attack against government witnesses and informants of the FBI has its roots in a Communist effort to stem the successful campaign of this government to eliminate the subversion threat of communism to our internal security. It has as its objective the hamstringing of the FBI's informant system."

Any witnesses who have lied for pay have been encouraged to keep the fact to themselves. Mrs. Natvig who recanted, has been indicted on nine counts (a possible 45-year jail sentence)—none of them bearing on the truth or falsity of her charges, now recanted, against Mr. Lamb. The grand jury indicted her without giving her or her side of the case a hearing. (N. Y. Times, March 8, 1955).

In Texas, Matusow has been sentenced to jail for attempting to "obstruct justice" by questioning the conviction of Jencks, against whom he now swears he lied. The Jencks request for a new trial has been denied, and no inquiry as to whether he has been jailed by false testimony has been opened up. Rather, Matusow, for stating it, has been sent to jail also.

Mr. Brownell enters the picture to seek a revision in perjury law, so he can get persons indicted for perjury who contradicted themselves under oath—without having to consider or decide which statements were true and which false. Thus Mr. Brownell could get Matusow indicted for perjury without requisite court examination of the possibility that the perjury committed was in collaboration with Mr. Brownell's own Justice Department and to help convict scores of American political heretics now in jail. If the requested change is granted it might prove a weighty deterrent to other paid informers, who might not now be so easily tempted to confess to THEIR past perjury.

Meanwhile, "Senator Wayne Morse attacked the Justice Department's use of 'paid stooges' such as Matusow as its 'substitute for hard work.' 'If we had efficient, competent men administering justice,' he asserted, 'we would not need to resort to this practice.'"

When will there be sufficient concern in the churches to effect a return to the old-fashioned virtue of honesty, and rededication to the Old Testament law: "Thou shalt not bear false witness?"

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year.

25c per copy.

Issued monthly, October through May, and one summer issue.

METHODIST FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL ACTION
(Unofficial)

President, Dr. Loyd Worley; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Mary Phillips, Rev. Lee H. Ball, Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson; Recording Secretary, Miss Janice M. Roberts; Treasurer, Rev. Edward Peet.

Membership Secretary, Mark Chamberlin.

Field Secretaries, I. DeQuincy Newman, Willard Uphaus.

Editorial Secretary and Editor, Jack R. McMichael.

Editorial Office and Office of Publication
P. O. Box 327, Gresham, Oregon.

Re-entered as second class matter Sept. 15, 1953, at the Postoffice at Gresham, Oregon, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

Behind the headlines about when Matusow was lying there is a deeper issue. It is the Justice Department practice of hiring, and using ex-communist informer witnesses. Throughout history this practice has produced false testimony, and always in accelerated degree.

In our instance the facts are beyond question. Paid informer witnesses have been continuously used in the political trials and investigations of the past few years. They move from case to case in two classes. One is used as wanted, on a per diem basis. The other is on the payroll as counsellors in the section of Immigration and Naturalization, under annual contracts. These guarantee a minimum of 18 days work per month at \$25 per day. The rest of the month the informers are free to work elsewhere for congressional committees, state prosecutors, private red hunters. The record of all the major witnesses contains evidence of false testimony.

For several years a few editors, columnists and political leaders have called in vain for action by the Justice Department concerning this false testimony. The negative reaction of the department reveals the moral decay generated by the practice of using paid informers. The Religious Freedom Committee last year submitted evidence of false testimony, including admission under oath, against ministers and religious organizations. The Department turned a deaf ear.

At a recent news conference, Attorney General Brownell stated that testing the credibility of witnesses was a 24 hour a day job in his department. He was asked what had been done about last year's request from the U. N. that the false testimony of two paid informers about its unanimously cleared high official, Ralph Bunche, be examined for perjury. His answer was that he had never heard of it. These were two of the men who testified falsely against the ministers.

When verified data showing false testimony was made widely public by the Alsop brother columnists, and still more widely by the Matusow confessions, the department finally admitted its validity by refusing to renew the contracts of the four informers who had gained the most publicity. But its spokesmen defend the practice of using paid informers. The whole outcry against it is a communist plot says the assistant attorney general in charge of the Internal Security division. They have coined the word informer to discredit all government witnesses, he says.

The extent to which the use of paid informer testimony has corrupted legal ethics was shown last summer in a speech of the head of the Justice Department's Criminal division to the prosecuting attorneys of Michigan. His final argument was we only pay these witnesses \$25 a day and look at the number of communists we have convicted.

The use of paid informer witnesses is inevitably corrupting because it brings into play two anti-social motives. To keep his livelihood the informer has to produce more and more false testimony. A premium is put on perjury. For those who use him, success in securing convictions opens a way to promotion. So the upper ranks of the administration of justice are infiltrated by men who have lost the capacity of fulfilling their professional vow to seek the defense of the innocent equally with the punishment of the guilty.

The final plea for the use of paid informer witnesses is its necessity for the security of the nation. Actually this practice breeds insecurity. When injustice enters the halls of justice, a strand in the bond that holds the nation together is broken. As confidence in the administration of justice is lost, the nation falls apart in weakness, instead of being bound together in strength.

So the lawmakers of ancient Israel taught its people they must establish justice in the land. The Prophets proclaimed Jehovah is a God of justice; that He requires of persons that they do justly, and of the nation that it make justice to roll through the land like the rivers, and that unless these things were done no beauty or wealth of worship could gain response from their God. Jesus repeated these assertions.

It is time to heed these words. The first thing needed is a thorough investigation of the whole procedure of the Justice Department in hiring and using paid informers. A request for this is now before the Senate Sub-Committee on Civil Rights.

Our readers can, if they will, get enough letters added to this request to assure the investigation. This should be done, and at once. Address the Chairman, Senator Hennings, Senate Building, Washington, D. C. H.F.W.

ON HOUSE RULE CHANGES

The House Rules committee is considering favorably some exceedingly minor changes in the rules under which House committees are supposed to operate. They are supposed to give added protection to individuals called before such committees; and they show recognition of the wide public protest against unfair committee procedures. But a more fundamental needed rules change has been asked by MFSA—namely, that congressional committees tamper no more with the free exercise of religion, which Congress is forbidden to restrict, under the Constitution. Text of the MFSA Executive committee resolution follows:

Whereas: During the last session of Congress the Standing Committee of the House on UnAmerican Activities called before it Christian ministers, Rev. Jack R. McMichael and Rev. Prof. John Hutchinson and questioned them concerning utterances which were expressions of their religious conscience;

Whereas: Other witnesses, whose testimony was subsequently made public were called in Executive Session of Said Committee to testify with regard to the activities and utterances of Christian ministers and Jewish Rabbis;

Whereas: The record shows that activities of religious organizations, histories of religious movements, speeches and writings of ministers and rabbis, religious books and publications, even the nature of religion, were covered by questions, testimony and comments of Committee members;

Whereas: The record also shows that the Committee has issued publications concerning religion and religious organizations which are no reports of Hearings but involve the Committee on one side of a religious controversy which under our Constitution is no concern whatever of the state;

Whereas: The Congress of the United States is prohibited by the First Amendment to the Constitution from enacting legislation with respect to the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;

Whereas: House Rule XI concludes by limiting investigation to "question in relation thereto that would aid Congress in necessary remedial legislation."

Therefore: Be it resolved that Methodist Federation for Social Action through its Executive Committee meeting in Boston, November 30, 1954, calls on the Rules Committee to add to the "Power and Duties" of the Committee on UnAmerican Activities, and other committees, a specification making it clear that these committees are not empowered to engage in any investigation or any other activity, contrary to the first clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution.

(*Admittedly without any investigation or hearings, the House Committee on UnAmerican Activities, issued a distorted and biased "Review" of MFSA just before the last General Conference. Hastily published by the Committee the "Review" was sent by the Circuit Riders to all General Conference Delegates to help stimulate restrictive action. Additional facts as to the relation between the Circuit Riders and the Committee are requested.)

ACT NOW TO STOP UMT!

A striking fact about General MacArthur's American Legion address is its confession as to the self-defeating futility of the arms race in general and of peacetime conscription in particular. Yet legislation enlarging and extending conscription and making all young people subject to prolonged and compulsory military reserve training, is now before Congress. HR 2967 will be acted on soon. In hearings, now ended, official Methodist and other Protestant spokesmen testified in opposition. If you wish your voice to count, you must write NOW to your Congressmen and Senators. Letters will help also to Mr. Carl Vinson, chairman, and Mr. Dewey Short, minority leader, House Armed Services Committee, House Office Bldg., Washington, D. C.

IS THE BILL OF RIGHTS SUBVERSIVE?

"A few days ago . . . a group of state employees—not in Missouri—charged with responsibility for determining what announcements could be posted on the employees' bulletin board refused to permit the Bill of Rights to be posted on the ground that it was a controversial document . . . Only after the governor in writing vouched for its non-controversial character was the Bill of Rights permitted to occupy a place along with routine items of interest to the state employees. And this happened in the U. S. A. on the 15th day of December, 1954, the 163rd anniversary of our Bill of Rights. . . . It is straws in the wind like this which cause some thoughtful people to ask the question whether ratification of the Bill of Rights could be obtained today if we were faced squarely with the issue."

—Chief Justice Warren, at St. Louis, Feb. 1955